

worst forces in Russia and to the disadvantage of democrats in Russia.

Mr. President, the push for a larger NATO has already hurt our relations with Russia, as shown by the stalling of the START II agreements in the Duma, troubling frictions with Russia recently on issues ranging from U.S. policy toward Iraq, to proliferation issues, to the management of Russia's nuclear material.

My colleague, Senator MOYNIHAN, has had a distinguished career in diplomacy and international relations, and he was recently quoted as warning that extending the NATO alliance toward the frontier of Russia risks "the catastrophe of nuclear war." I cannot honestly say whether I think his analysis is right or wrong, but I have to ask myself is there any compelling reason for the U.S. rush to expand NATO if there is the slightest chance that it could trigger a nuclear war down the road. Why are we taking such a chance?

Dr. Arbatov, while in Washington last month to attend meetings at the Center for Political and Strategic Studies, took issue with those in the West who contend that Russians don't really care about NATO expansion. The following is a summary from his remarks that Arbatov approved:

Contrary to what is being said by many Western proponents of NATO, Russians do care about NATO expansion, and they are almost unanimously opposed. It is true that most Russians, like most Americans, are primarily concerned about everyday things and making ends meet. But almost everyone who has any interest in foreign affairs is very concerned. Millions of pensioners who remember World War II, all the military, workers in defense industries, intellectuals, government and political elites care very deeply about this issue. And nearly the full spectrum of Russian politicians is opposed to the expansion of NATO.

I want to conclude this way. Susan Eisenhower points out that not only are Russia's progressive forces being put under enormous pressure by NATO expansion, but there are signs Russian conservatives are already using it to their own advantage. Eisenhower stresses:

There is already tangible evidence that NATO expansion has given conservative forces—

Which has a different meaning, I say to my conservative colleagues here, than conservatism in America.

a platform. On January 23, the Duma overwhelmingly passed a resolution stating that NATO expansion is the "most serious military threat to our country since 1945." It also said that Baltic membership in NATO would be incompatible with the NATO-Russian Founding Act . . . The resolution requested that the Yeltsin government devise a program to counteract NATO expansion.

In pursuing NATO expansion, why is the administration disregarding the warnings of Russian democrats, George Kennan and other distinguished Russian scholars, that NATO expansion is likely to sow the seeds for the reemergence of antidemocratic and chauvinist trends in Russia? That is a serious threat, I say to my colleagues, to our

lives, our children's lives, and our grandchildren's lives.

I am especially puzzled by this since it must be evident to both supporters and foes of NATO expansion that European security and stability is greatly dependent on Russia's transition to democracy. A democratic Russia is unlikely to ever threaten its neighbors.

Why then are we considering a step that will weaken Russia's democrats and strengthen ultra-nationalists who oppose democracy? George Kennan has said—George Kennan who wrote the famous Mr. X article in *Foreign Affairs*; George Kennan, perhaps the most prominent thinker about Russia in our country—George Kennan with the most distinguished career possible has said that expanding NATO "may be expected to inflame nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies in Russian opinion [and] to have an adverse effect on the development of Russian democracy. * * *

Let me repeat that quote. George Kennan has said that expanding NATO "may be expected to inflame nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies in Russian opinion [and] to have an adverse effect on the development of Russian democracy * * *

I urge my colleagues to carefully consider George Kennan's wise words, the heartfelt words of Russian democrats, and the prophetic words of Senator Sam Nunn and join me in opposing ratification of NATO expansion.

Mr. President, I ask how much time I have left.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator has 3 minutes left.

Mr. WELLSTONE. I thank the Chair.

THE MURDER OF BISHOP JUAN GERARDI CONEDERA

Mr. WELLSTONE. Mr. President, in the 2 minutes I have remaining, I just want to bring to the attention of my colleagues that wonderful bishop in Guatemala, Juan Gerardi—a man of justice—who was assassinated on Sunday. He was the director and founder of the Human Rights Office of the Archdiocese of Guatemala. It has been absolutely devastating to the forces for democracy in Guatemala and to the forces for human rights.

On the floor of the Senate today, I just want to say that I believe, as a Senator, that our Government should make it crystal clear to the Government in Guatemala that we want a full accounting. I urge the U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala to ask the Guatemalan government to swiftly investigate this crime; it is a terrible setback to the effort to shine a light into the dark corners of our hemisphere's history.

What we know so far is that on Sunday, April 26, Bishop Gerardi was assaulted and killed as he entered his home. His attacker, whose identity is unknown, smashed the Bishop's head with such brutality that his features were obliterated and his body could

only be identified by his ring. Nothing was stolen from Bishop Gerardi's body or his house, nor was his car stolen.

When you have a courageous Catholic bishop who has been such a strong advocate for human rights murdered, we need to know—the people in Guatemala need to know—what happened. There needs to be accountability.

Mr. President, this vicious crime is all the more terrible because of the context in which it occurred. On Friday, Bishop Gerardi had released the Archdiocese's report on past human rights violations in Guatemala entitled "Guatemala: Never Again." He directed the Catholic Church's effort to gather information on the long, tragic history of massacres, killings, and torture in that country. These efforts are an important part of the people of Guatemala's efforts to come to terms with their past, through a full and accurate accounting of past human rights abuses.

I do not prejudice this. I do not know who committed this brutal assassination. But like the Catholic Church in our country and like people all across the world who care so much about democracy and human rights, as a Senator, I do call on the Government of Guatemala to launch an immediate investigation into the murder of Bishop Gerardi, and to make sure that they bring this to closure and we find out who was responsible for this barbaric act. Whether or not this was a crime against a man who was merely in the wrong place at the wrong time or a carefully calculated attack against the Bishop and his work, the truth must be brought to light. Adding another mystery to the labyrinth of deaths, disappearances, and shattered lives in Guatemala would compound the tragedy of the loss of one of Latin America's great human rights leaders.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the statement from the Human Rights Office of the Archbishop of Guatemala, as well as a copy of my letter to the U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala, be printed in the RECORD.

I thank my colleagues for their courtesy. I yield the floor.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OFFICE OF HUMAN RIGHTS, ARCHBISHOP OF GUATEMALA.

In the Face of the Abominable Assassination of Monseñor Juan José Gerardi Conedera, The Human Rights Office of the Archbishop of Guatemala Announces:

1. Its profound pain and indignation for the cowardly and brutal assassination of Monseñor Gerardi, the founder and General Coordinator of this office.

2. On Sunday, April 26 at around 10:00 pm, when he was entering his house after doing a routine family visit, Monseñor Gerardi was attacked by an individual who was not identified. The assassin first hit Mons. Gerardi on the back of the head with a piece of cement, and later delivered blows to the bishop's face, disfiguring it. The individual returned to a site near the crime ten minutes later, having changed his clothes since they had been soaked with the bishop's

blood. No object of value was stolen from the house, nor was his vehicle taken (which he was getting out of when attacked), nor was any personal item touched by the assassin.

3. Forty-eight hours earlier, Monseñor Gerardi had presided at the Metropolitan Cathedral, along with other bishops from the Guatemalan Episcopal Conference, for the public presentation of the report entitled, "Guatemala: Nunca Más." The report documents and analyzes tens of thousands of cases of human rights violations that occurred during the armed conflict. Mons. Gerardi was the coordinating bishop for the Interdiocesan Project "The Recuperation of Historic Memory" which produced the report.

4. Mons. Gerardi was Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Guatemala since 1984. From 1967 to 1976 he was bishop of Las Verapaces, where he laid the groundwork for the Indigenous Pastoral. Later he was named bishop of El Quiché, where he had to confront the time of the worst violence against the population. The assassination of various priests and catechists and the harassment of the Church by the military obliged him to close down the diocese of El Quiché in June of 1980. Weeks before that, Mons. Gerardi had escaped an ambush. When he was president of the Episcopal Conference, the authorities denied him entry into his own country and he was forced to remain in exile for two years until he was able to return in 1984.

5. The assassination of Monseñor Gerardi is a ruthless aggression against the Church of Guatemala—which for the first time has lost a bishop in a violent manner—and against the Catholic people, and represents a heavy blow to the peace process.

6. We demand that the authorities clarify this tragedy within a period of time not to exceed 72 hours, because if impunity is allowed to extend to this case it will bring grave cost to the Republic of Guatemala.

7. To the people of Guatemala and the international community we ask your resolute support and solidarity in this difficult moment for the Catholic Church. This treacherous crime has shocked everyone, but in this time of trial we should remain firm and united in order to keep the violence and terror that the Guatemala people have suffered from taking possession of Guatemala and make us lose the political space which has been won at such great sacrifice.

As Monseñor Gerardi said, in his April 24th address at the presentation of the REHMI report, "We want to contribute to the building of a country different than the one we have now. For that reason we are recovering the memory of our people. This path has been and continues to be full of risks, but the construction of the Reign of God has risks and can only be built by those that have the strength to confront those risks."

U.S. SENATE,
Washington, DC, April 29, 1998.

Hon. DONALD PLANTY,
U.S. Ambassador to Guatemala, Embassy of the
United States, Guatemala City, Guatemala.

DEAR AMBASSADOR PLANTY: I was profoundly shocked and saddened when I received the news of the murder of Bishop Juan Gerardi, Coordinator of the Human Rights Office of the Archbishop of Guatemala.

The circumstances, as I understand it, still remain unclear. However, a spokesman for the Archdiocese of Guatemala City suggested that this murder could be related to the public release of the REHMI Report on Friday, April 24th, just 48 hours before this deplorable killing.

It appears that many believe that this case does not fall into the category of "common crime." Former President Ramiro de Leon

Carplo, U.N. Secretary General Kofi Annan, and others have voiced their concerns about the possible political nature of this incident and I am sure this question is on the mind of many other Guatemalans.

I urge you, Ambassador Planty, to let the officials of the Guatemalan government know that Members of Congress anticipate a full and thorough investigation of this tragic event. We hope to learn not only who the perpetrators were, but whatever other factors and motivations, if any, were involved in this terrible crime.

Thank you for your attention to my concerns.

Sincerely,

PAUL WELLSTONE,
U.S. Senator.

Mr. GRAMS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. GRAMS. I ask unanimous consent that I be allowed to speak for up to 5 minutes in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. I also ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Georgia, Senator CLELAND, be allowed to speak following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. GRAMS. Thank you very much.

(The remarks of Mr. GRAMS pertaining to the introduction of S. 2004 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

Mr. GRAMS. I yield the floor.

Mr. CLELAND addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia is recognized.

Mr. CLELAND. I thank the Senator from Minnesota.

PROTOCOLS TO THE NORTH ATLANTIC TREATY OF 1949 ON ACCESSION OF POLAND, HUNGARY, AND THE CZECH REPUBLIC

The Senate continued with the consideration of the treaty.

Mr. CLELAND. Mr. President, I am honored to have the opportunity to engage in this debate over the proposed expansion of the NATO treaty. It is an important occasion for this body, for our country, and for the shape of the post-cold war world. To quote Emerson, who had in turn been quoted by the great American statesman Dean Acheson about the dawning of the post-World War II era, "we are present at the sowing of the seed of creation."

It is a debate which has properly engaged the best minds in American foreign and national security policy. George Kennan, the architect of the successful "containment" strategy with which NATO won the cold war, has said,

Expanding NATO would be the most fateful error of American policy in the entire post-Cold War era. Such a decision may be expected to inflame the nationalistic, anti-Western and militaristic tendencies in Russian opinion; to have an adverse effect on the development of Russian democracy; to restore the atmosphere of the Cold War to East-West relations; and to impel Russian

foreign policy in directions decidedly not to our liking.

That is the quote of Mr. Kennan. My predecessor, and someone whose views on national security matters I most value, former Senator Sam Nunn, has said, "NATO expansion makes our security problems more difficult," and Senator Nunn cowrote a recent magazine article with former Senator Howard Baker, Alton Frye and Brent Scowcroft which states that, "by premature action on new members, the Senate could condemn a vital alliance to creeping impotence."

On the other hand, the architect of America's detente strategy, Henry Kissinger, testified to our Senate Armed Services Committee that,

Failure to expand NATO is likely to prove irrevocable. Russian opposition is bound to grow as its economy gains strength; the nations of Central Europe may drift out of their association with Europe. The end result would be the vacuum between Germany and Russia that has tempted so many previous conflicts. When NATO recoils from defining the only limits that make strategic sense, it is opting for progressive irrelevance.

And Zbigniew Brzezinski, with whom I served in the Carter Administration, has testified that,

NATO enlargement has global significance—it is central to the step-by-step construction of a secure international system in which the Euroatlantic alliance plays the major role in ensuring that a peaceful and democratic Europe is America's principal partner.

Mr. President, these are strong and important words from some of our country's premier experts on international relations, and of course they point the Senate in diametrically opposite directions in the current debate. However, and I will return to this point later, in my view they all raise the right questions and ultimately can help point us in the right direction as we take up the critical questions of whether NATO and whether Europe will remain with us regardless of what we do on the pending resolution of ratification. Though I certainly acknowledge the importance of the impending decision, I would counsel that we not engage in exaggeration or hyperbole about the consequences of this single choice. It is but the first, and in my opinion probably not the most important, question we must answer as we feel our way in this unknown "new world order," and no one, and certainly not this Senator, knows for certain how the future will unfold in Russia, or in the rest of Europe, for that matter.

So I welcome and I appreciate the thoughtful commentary which has been submitted on both sides of this issue. I have benefited from it, and I certainly believe that neither side has a corner on wisdom or concern for our future security. In this same spirit, I would like to thank the distinguished Majority Leader for responding to two requests I made, one in a letter I co-signed with a number of other Senators on March 3, and the other in a personal